

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 stand objected to for various informalities. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 14 to remedy the informalities.

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowers in view of Can and Goodwin. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

None of the references teaches or suggests combining the functionality of an electronic price label with that of an RFID interrogator to perform inventory management as claimed.

Both Bowers and Can are directed to RFID systems. Neither suggests using an electronic price label or electronic price label system to send RFID label information to an inventory management system.

Goodwin discloses display of price information by an electronic price label. A transaction management system determines the price information based upon current inventory levels. Goodwin fails to teach or suggest an electronic price label or electronic price label system that obtains and sends RFID information from adjacent products to an inventory management system.

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashton in view of Goodwin. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Ashton teaches that an electronic price display may be mounted on the disclosed shelf system. However, since Ashton discloses that RFID label sensors be integrated into the shelf system, Ashton provides no motivation to one skilled in the art to integrate the functionality of an RFID interrogator with that of an electronic price label instead to perform inventory management as claimed.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-14 are in condition for allowance. Action to that end is hereby respectfully solicited.



Paul W. Martin
Attorney for Applicant
Phone: (937) 445-2990

Dayton, OH

JUN 10 2004